

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Jeanglaude for the courtesies extended during the interview on October 5, 2005. The Official Action dated August 23, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully noted. At the outset, the Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the Examiner's allowance of claims 9, 10, 16, and 21-38. In view of the following remarks, however, reconsideration of this application is still requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 11-15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0194051 to Hall et al. in view of Office of Defects Investigation (<http://www-odi.nhtsa.dot.gov/cars/problems/recalls>) and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0016655 to Joao. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, because the combination of references fails to disclose the present invention as claimed.

In particular, claim 1 recites: "if no reliability issue record exists, then determining whether said database should contain reliability issue information regarding the particular vehicle; and if said database should include reliability issue information regarding the particular vehicle, displaying an electronically displayable file related to the absence of a reliability issue for the particular vehicle." Claim 11 recites: "reliability issue module adapted to . . . determine whether said database should contain reliability issue information regarding the particular vehicle if no reliability issue record exists, and, if said database should include reliability issue information, to display an electronically displayable file related to the absence of a reliability issue for the particular vehicle. Claim 17 recites: "instructions for determining whether said database should contain reliability issue information regarding the particular vehicle if no reliability issue record exists and for displaying an electronically displayable file related to the absence of a reliability issue for the particular vehicle if said database should include reliability issue information."

Thus, the limitations of independent base claims 1, 11, and 17 require determining whether a database related to a particular vehicle should contain reliability issue information regarding the particular vehicle when no record exists, and displaying a file related to the absence of a reliability issue if the database should contain reliability issue information

regarding the particular vehicle. However, the combination of the cited references fails to disclose these elements of the claimed invention. In the Office Action, the Examiner, moreover, does not even address these limitations in claims 1, 11, and 17, and fails to explain how the cited references disclose these limitations. Thus, as indicated in the Interview Summary for the October 5, 2005 interview, Applicant respectfully requests further reconsideration of the claims, particularly with respect to a determination of whether a database should contain a reliability record.

Because the combination of the references currently cited fails to disclose all elements of the claimed invention, Applicant submits that withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 11, and 17 is currently in order and is respectfully requested. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-8, 12-15, and 18-20 are allowable since they depend on what is now believed to be allowable base claims 1, 11, and 17.

Therefore, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. However, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicants' representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tim L. Brackett, Jr.', written over a horizontal line.

Tim L. Brackett, Jr.
Registration No. 36,092

Nixon Peabody LLP
401 9th Street, N.W. Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000